

**113 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA  
AT CHANDIGARH**

**CRR No.1852 of 2017 (O&M)  
Date of decision : July 18, 2017**

**Puran Singh**

**..... Petitioner**

**Versus**

**Rajiv Aggarwal and others**

**..... Respondents**

**CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDIP SINGH**

**Present:-** Mr. J.S. Virk, Advocate for the petitioner.

1. Whether the Reporters of local newspaper may be allowed to see the judgment ?
2. To be referred to the Reporter or not.
3. Whether the judgment should be reported in the digest ?

**KULDIP SINGH J. (ORAL)**

Learned counsel for the petitioner has filed some document in the Court today and the same are taken on record.

Heard.

Petitioner is aggrieved of the order dated 15.04.2017 passed by learned Judicial Magistrate 1<sup>st</sup> Class, Karnal, vide which his application filed under Section 311 Cr.P.C. was dismissed.

Brief controversy of the case is that the petitioner has filed a criminal complaint against respondent under Sections 406, 420, 467, 468, 471, 506 read with Section 34 IPC. It comes out from the history of the case file that on being summoned, the accused-revisionist had put in appearance before the trial court in the year 2013. Thereafter, pre-charge evidence was led and the charges were framed in the year 2016 and thereafter, the complainant led further evidence. Thereafter, the statement of the accused-revisionist under Section 313 Cr.P.C. was recorded and the case is now fixed for defence evidence and arguments.

The present revisionist wants to produce the copy of the written statement filed in a civil suit titled as 'Puran Singh vs The Karnal CSSRI, which is stated to be pending for arguments before the learned Addl. District Judge, Karnal. He also wants to file the copies of the entries made in the account in the year 2006 by the respondent.

I am of the view that before the trial court has observed that sufficient evidence was led. It is not shown how this evidence sought to be produced is material. Both the parties have already led evidence. The case is already more than four years old. Therefore, there is no ground to interfere in the impugned order.

Accordingly, the present revision petition is dismissed.

**(KULDIP SINGH)**  
**JUDGE**

**July 18, 2017**

sarita

Whether speaking / reasoned                      Yes

Whether Reportable:                                      No